



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,925	01/23/2001	Kaius Kiiren Polikarpus	DP-300566	1447

7590 10/23/2002

VINCENT A. CICHOSZ
DELPHI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Staff Mail Code: 480-414-420
P.O. Box 5052
Troy, MI 48007-5052

EXAMINER

OLSEN, KAJ K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1744

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/767,925

Applicant(s)

POLIKARPUS ET AL.

Examiner

Kaj Olsen

Art Unit

1744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of group I in Paper No. 4 is acknowledged. Even though the non-elected claims have been canceled, applicant traverses the restriction requirement on the ground(s) that, with respect to groups I and II, claim 33 (group II) is drawn to the sensor of claim 16 (group I). However, the product of group II does not appear to be bounded by the process of group I (i.e. claim 33 was drawn to a sensor of claim 16 and not a sensor *constructed by the process* of claim 16). Moreover, even if the applicant had properly made claim 33 properly depend from claim 16, restriction can still be required if it determined that the product of the process could be made by a different process, which the examiner established in paragraph two of the original requirement.
2. With respect to the restriction between groups I and III, applicant urges that because the product has not been examined, there are no grounds to state it is unallowable. However, MPEP 806.05(i) states that “[d]etermination of patentability of the product need not be made prior to making a requirement for restriction”.
3. Because the restriction requirement between groups I and II was proper, and the statement stating the product is not allowable is proper, the restriction between groups I and III is also proper, and the requirement is made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1744

5. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. In claims 1 and 16, applicant specifies a step of co-firing, but does not specifying what specifically is being co-fired.

7. In claims 2, 6, 20, and 21, it is unclear what the percentage of monoclinic zirconia is based on (the total weight of the zirconia or the total weight of the zirconia-alumina body?). For the purpose of applying prior art, the examiner has interpreted in as being drawn to the former.

8. With respect to claims 9 and 27, there is no antecedent basis for the term "said laminated mixture" because no previous lamination has been set forth.

9. In claim 16, there is no antecedent basis for "said alumina body".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 1744

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claims 1, 4, 6-16, 18, 20-22, and 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama et al (USP 6,258,233) in view of Frieze et al (USP 4,221,650) with evidence provided by Practical Handbook of Material Science.

13. With respect to claim 1, Sugiyama discloses a method of manufacturing a zirconia-alumina body that comprises mixing zirconia, yttria, and at least one solvent to form a mixture (col. 7, lines 48-56). Said mixture is dried (col. 7, line 60) and disposed adjacent to an unfired alumina body (13 and/or 16) and the zirconia and the alumina bodies are co-fired together (col. 8, lines 11-19 and lines 34-38). The zirconia utilized by Sugiyama comprises a percentage of monoclinic phase, as measured from the diffraction intensities, that varies between 5 and 25 % based on the total weight of zirconia (col. 2, lines 38-50).

14. Sugiyama does not explicitly suggest also including alumina to the zirconia mixture, Frieze teaches in an alternate method for preparing zirconia for electrochemical sensors that adding alumina to the zirconia mixture improves the heat conductivity of a constructed sensor while also reducing its coefficient of expansion (col. 3, lines 2-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to utilize the teaching of Frieze for the method of Sugiyama in order to improve the constructed sensors heat conductivity and reduce its coefficient of expansion.

15. With respect to claims 4, 7, and 8, see Sugiyama, col. 7, lines 55-57.

16. With respect to claim 6, Sugiyama particularly teaches the use of compositions between 18 and 25 % monoclinic (fig. 13 and tables 1-3).

Art Unit: 1744

17. With respect to claim 9, although neither Sugiyama nor Friese specify a particular sintering mismatch, this would appear to the examiner to be a function of the percentage of monoclinic zirconia utilized for the body (as taught by Sugiyama) and/or the addition of alumina to the mixture (as taught by Friese). Hence the method as set forth above would inherently produce a laminated mixture and alumina surface having the claimed mismatched.

18. With respect to claims 10 and 11, see Sugiyama, col. 13, lines 19-22.

19. With respect to claim 12, see Sugiyama, col. 7, line 54.

20. With respect to claims 13 and 14, Sugiyama teaches the use of 6 mol% yttrium oxide (col. 7, lines 50 and 51) and Friese has embodiments of 4 and 7 % by volume Al_2O_3 (the table on col. 9). Although Friese reports these quantities in terms of volume, the Practical Handbook of Materials Science evidences that these compositions read on mol percentages of claims 13 and 14 even when the differences in density and molecular weight between alumina and zirconia are taken into account.

21. With respect to claim 15, see Sugiyama, col. 7, line 65 through col. 8, line 3.

22. With respect to claim 16 (those limitations not covered above for claim 1), Sugiyama teaches disposing an electrode onto each side of the unfired zirconia body and connecting each electrode to an electrical lead (col. 7, line 65 through col. 8, line 3).

23. With respect to claim 18, layers 16 and 22 would constitute support layers and a heater 25 is disposed within the support layers (fig. 1).

24. With respect to claims 20-22 and 25-32, see the previous rejections for claims 6, 6, 4, and 7-14 respectively.

Art Unit: 1744

25. Claims 2, 3, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Friese as applied to claims 1 and 22 above, and further in view of Aizawa et al (USP 5,968,673).

26. The references set forth all the limitations of the claims, but did not explicitly set forth the presence of a dispersant in the mixture. Aizawa teaches in an alternate solid electrolyte construction that adding a dispersant to a ceramic mixture (i.e. slurry) improves the dispersion of the particles in the slurry allowing for a more homogeneous mixture (col. 4, lines 20-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to utilize the teaching of a dispersant in order to create a homogeneous mixture of the electrolyte particles. With respect to the concentration of monoclinic zirconia in the zirconia-alumina, see the rejection for claim 6 above. With respect to the particular composition of the dispersant, Aizawa teaches the use of a phosphate ester (col. 4, lines 26 and 27).

27. Claims 5 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Friese as applied to claims 1 and 22 above, and further in view of Wang (USP 4,897,174).

28. The references set forth all the limitations of the claims, but did not explicitly recite the step of de-airing the mixture. Wang teaches in an alternate electrochemical sensor construction that exposing a ceramic mixture (i.e. a slurry) to a vacuum (i.e. de-airing) ensures that the slurry possesses no trapped air (col. 3, lines 32-34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to utilize the teaching of Wang for the method of Sugiyama and Friese in order to ensure that there is no trapped air in the mixture.

Art Unit: 1744

29. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama and Friese as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Kojima et al (USP 5,849,165).

30. The references set forth all the limitations of the claim, but Sugiyama did not explicitly suggest disposing a protective layer adjacent to the unfired zirconia on a side opposite the alumina side. Kojima teaches in an alternate sensor that the application of a protective layer over the measuring electrode protects said electrode from Si-poisoning (col. 2, lines 3-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to utilize the teaching of Kojima for the method of Sugiyama in view of Friese in order to protect the sensor from silicon poisoning.

31. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Friese as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Lankheet (USP 6,346,178).

32. The references set forth all the limitations of the claim, but did not explicitly recite the presence of a ground plane between the heater and the alumina body. Lankheet teaches in an alternate electrochemical sensor that the inclusion of a ground plane 42 can prevent the premature failure of the heater (col. 4, lines 52-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was being made to utilize the teaching of Lankheet for the method of Sugiyama and Friese in order to prevent the premature failure of the heater.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaj Olsen whose telephone number is (703) 305-0506. The

Art Unit: 1744

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM-6:00 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Robert Warden, can be reached at (703) 308-2920.

When filing a fax in Group 1700, please indicate in the header "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communications with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of this application. This will expedite processing of your papers. The fax number for non-after final communications is (703) 872-9310 and the fax number form after-final communications is (703) 872-9311.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kaj K. Olsen', with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

Kaj K. Olsen
Patent Examiner
AU 1744
October 18, 2002